

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed July 5, 2007. Claims 1–23 and 25–26 are cancelled. Claims 24 and 27–33 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of claims 24, and 27-33 is appreciated. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of those claims.

The Applicant's submit the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of claims 1-24 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant's do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Young et al.* ("Enhanced Performance of Offset-Gain High-Barrier Vertical-Cavity Surface-Emitting Lasers", dated June 1993) in view of *Kasper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,191). Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, and 16. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5th day of November, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew S. Hansen/Reg.#56370

ANDREW S. HANSEN
Registration No. 36,596
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800